DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 924 HE 026 662

AUTHOR Annis, Ann W.; Rice, Rodger R.
TITLE A Comparative Study of Inquiries, No-Shows, and College Freshmen. AIR 1993 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE May 93
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (33rd, Chicago, IL, May 16-19, 1993).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Church Related Colleges; College Admission; *College Bound Students; College Choice; *College Freshmen; Comparative Analysis; Decision Making; *Enrollment Influences; Higher Education; Institutional Research; *No Shows; Student Financial Aid; *Student Reaction; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum; *Calvin College MI

ABSTRACT

A three-part study conducted at a medium-sized, Christian comprehensive college in Michigan (Calvin College) examined the college choice process including why students apply but do not enroll, as well as the reasons why students enroll. Subjects consisted of: (1) those who made multiple inquiries and had multiple contacts with the college but did not apply (N=247); (2) admitted students who did not enroll (N=274); and (3) incoming freshmen (N=822). Subjects were asked, in part, what was important in their college-choice decision, how the college compared to their final choice (or the second choice of enrolled freshmen), and their comparative impressions of the schools under consideration. The most important reasons for not attending Calvin reported by admitted students not enrolling and those making inquiries but not applying were location, high cost, receiving a better offer, and losing interest. Lack of adequate financial aid was also a major influence for those not enrolling. (Contains five references.) (GLR)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 360 924

# A Comparative Study of Inquirers, No-Shows, and College Freshmen

Prepared for Presentation
at the
33rd Annual Forum
of the
Association for Institutional Research
Chicago, Illinois
May 16-19, 1993

By
Ann W. Annis,
Assistant Director
and
Rodger R. Rice,
Director

HE 026 662

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Calvin College Social Research Center
3201 Burton Street SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49546
(616) 957-6420 or 957-6241

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

*for Management Research, Policy Analysis, and Planning*

This paper was presented at the Thirty-Third Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at the Chicago Marriott Downtown, Chicago, Illinois, May 16-19, 1993. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum Papers.

Jean Endo
Chair and Editor
Forum Publications
Editorial Advisory Committee

## Abstract

With the pool of potential students decreasing, colleges and universities are looking for ways to entice their share of the market. This paper describes a three-part study conducted at a medium-sized, Christian comprehensive college: inquirers who had multiple contacts with the college but did not apply; no-shows, admitted students who did not enroll; and incoming freshmen. All subjects were asked, in part, what was important in their college-choice decision, how the college compared to their final choice (or the second choice of freshmen), and their comparative impressions of the schools.

## A Comparative Study of Inquirers, No-Shows, and College Freshmen

### Introduction

The purpose of the study was to understand the college choice process for Calvin College: why students inquire but do not apply, why students apply but do not enroll, and why students enroll. Information was sought on 1) when and how the choice decision is made, 2) who influences the decision, 3) what influences the decision, 4) what qualities are desired in a college, 5) why potential students choose not to apply or attend, and 6) where they went if they didn't come to Calvin.

In the summer of 1991, the admissions office of Calvin College, a 4,000-student Christian comprehensive college, asked the college's Social Research Center (SRC) to help refine questionnaires and collect the data for a study of three groups at different stages of the college's recruitment funnel. One survey was conducted on a sample of high school students who had at least four contacts with the college but had never applied for admission (Inquirers). A second group had applied and been accepted, but later informed the college they would not attend (No-Shows). The third group was that portion of the fall of 1992 incoming freshman class who were first time in any college (FTIACs). In addition, No-Shows and FTIACs from the 1990 and 1992 years have also been surveyed, giving comparable data for some questions for those years.

### Literature Review

> The basic premise of marketing is that an institution . . . will . . . advance its . . .interests most effectively by taking into account the interests of others (e.g., consumers, clients, publics). (Litten, Sullivan and Brodigan, 1983, p. 14).

Ihlanfeldt (1980) refers to higher education as a service industry, noting that few faculty members and administrators have perceived their role as that of meeting consumer needs. Due to a questioning of a college degree's value in relation to its cost and a decreasing potential-student pool, colleges are realizing that their task in recruitment is changing. "Understanding the student recruitment process requires an investigation into the process of choosing a college and how college is viewed by the typical student interested in the institution" (p.12). Only after you understand market demand can you properly create promotional pieces to address that demand.

Litten (1980, in Litten et al., 1983) suggests that the commonly-used consumer-goods marketing may not be the most appropriate kind for higher education. Continuing in that vein, Kottler and Andreasen (1987) observe that colleges and universities are moving from a product orientation, where the main task is putting out products they think would be good for the public, to a sales orientation, where the main task is stimulating the interest of potential consumers in their existing products and services -- moving from "you come to us and we'll accept you if you fit" to "what can we do to attract you?" In a sales orientation, an institution must understand the process of choice narrowing, including what factors play a part and how important each factor is, and it must identify major competitors. "To be effective marketers in situations where consumers make complex decisions, we must always start with a clear understanding of the target customers' perceptions, needs, and wants" (Kottler and Andreasen, p 97). In addition, behavioral intention depends on the influence of others. What others? How much influence do they have? And how do people perceive the institution?

Litten et al. also describe the college admissions funnel -- beginning with Prospectives or Inquirers, and narrowing to Applicants, Admitted Applicants, and finally to Matriculants -- and their own work at Carleton College. When the school realized that student self-selection was failing to deliver the more capable students, they began analyzing data from records kept on Inquirers (from recruiting contacts), Applicants (from Carleton's Admissions Application Form), and from the annual survey of freshmen for the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). According to Urban (1992), however, their efforts, however, focus on increasing the number of applications rather than on increasing yield. In general, the Carleton research showed that high school visits from admissions counselors had no independent effect on probability of enrollment but campus visit was important: with it there was a 50% increase in probability that the student would be admitted, and a 100% increase in probability that he or she would enroll. The principal reasons students chose to attend Carleton were academic reputation, size, coeducation, and location. Location and academic reputation were the principal reasons for declining Carleton's offer of admission.

Northwestern University surveyed two groups -- those who expressed interest but did not apply, and all admitted students. They suggested that if the first group included only those who visited and had an interview, the response rate would likely be higher. They found that "published price discourages a substantial number of prospects regardless of the amount of financial aid available" and it was the main reason given for not applying (Ihlanfeldt, p. 39).

## Methodology

SRC requested that a random sample of 693 names of Inquirers who had *at least four contacts* with Calvin be selected by the college's computer. In addition, SRC obtained a list of all 459 No-Show names. All 860 FTIACs were surveyed during orientation. Because there would be next to no incentive for No-Shows and Inquirers to complete our questionnaires, we decided to offer the opportunity to win a $50 gift certificate at the store of the winner's choice. Five Inquirer and two No-Show winners were selected.

Beginning with a list of potential questions supplied by the consultant, SRC drafted Inquirer and No-Show questionnaires. The FTIAC questionnaire was an adaptation of the others.

The questionnaires were printed with brightly-colored covers, green for Inquirers, yellow for No-Shows, and blue for FTIACs. Cards which were entered into the drawings, on which respondents wrote their names, addresses and the names and addresses of the store to which they wanted the $50 gift certificate, were of the same colors. The cards were returned with the questionnaires, to assure that each card-sender did indeed complete a questionnaire.

Each packet included a personalized cover letter, an anonymous questionnaire, a card which doubled as an anonymous reply card and drawing entry, and a business reply envelope. The initial Inquirer and No-Show packets were sent in July of 1991. About two weeks later a postcard reminder was sent to all nonrespondents, and in another two weeks a second complete packet was sent. Data collection was cut off in September, after which prize drawings were held.

As the packets were returned, the cards were immediately separated for recordkeeping and the questionnaires were numbered and set aside for coding. Once a respondent's card was "checked in," it was placed in a box prepared for that color card. Thank you cards were sent saying their entry into the drawing had been received.

SRC administered the FTIAC survey during fall orientation. Student orientation leaders were instructed about the questionnaires and the administration process and given packets containing enough questionnaires for all FTIACs in their orientation groups. Completed questionnaires were collected by the leaders and returned to SRC by intracampus mail.

Code manuals were written; data were coded, check-coded, keypunched and verified; and SPSS programs were written and run. Comments and open-ended responses were typed. Completed questionnaires were received from 247 Inquirers (a response rate of 35.7%), 274 No-Shows (a response rate of 59.7%) and 822 FTIACs (a response rate of 95.6%).

In addition to the 1991 surveys, surveys of No-Shows and FTIACs were conducted in 1990 and 1992. All persons admitted as freshmen to Calvin College in summer of 1990 were sent one of three questionnaires (one for those enrolled who had sent a deposit, another for those who had informed the college they wouldn't attend, and a third for those who at that time had no final disposition). The third category questionnaires were placed into one of the first two groups when final disposition was determined. Compared to the 1991 surveys, the 1990 questionnaires were shorter, though with similar content areas. Responses were received from 312 No-Shows (55.1%) and 829 FTIACs (86.0%). In 1992, 321 No-Shows (51.1%) returned completed

questionnaires sent during the summer; 762 FTIACs (94.3%) completed questionnaires during fall orientation.

When no date is indicated, the data in the following report were collected in 1991.

## Selected Results

### When and How the Decision is Made

When do high school students make their college choice decision? At least three fourths in all respondent groups made this decision after beginning their senior year of high school. In 1991, 55.9% of Inquirers, 82.7% of No-Shows, and 38.4% of FTIACs indicated a decision in spring of or summer after their senior year. Responses in 1992 show a similar pattern, with 81.9% of No-Shows and 41.2% of FTIACs making their decision in that spring or summer.

And how did potential students first learn about Calvin College? For FTIACs (40.6%) and No-Shows (21.9%), the top answer was parents, followed by friends (11.7% and 13.1%); the third most common answer was "I don't remember" (11.0% and 11.3%). Inquirers, however, saw magazine ads (20.8%) and recruitment publications (18.4%), and talked with friends (9.4%).

Respondents were asked the number of colleges or universities to which they had applied. No-Shows applied to the most, with a mean of 3.7 schools, followed by Inquirers with 2.9 and FTIACs with 2.2.

How difficult was it to make the decision between Calvin and another school? Almost two of every five FTIACs (38.8%) had no second choice school; 2.2% of No-Shows decided not to attend college. Of the remaining respondents in these two

groups, two of every three (NS: 67.2%; F: 63.6%) found the final decision somewhat or very difficult. A similar, but slightly different, question was asked in 1990 and 1992. No-Shows were asked "how difficult was it to make the decision not to attend Calvin?" FTIACs were asked "how difficult was...the decision to attend Calvin?" For those years, No-Shows found it somewhat or very difficult (67.6%), whereas FTIACs found the decision somewhat or very easy (70.8%). In the 1991 data, only those FTIACs who had a second-choice school were included, but in 1990 and 1992 the percentage was based on all FTIAC respondents.

Who Influences the Decision

From a list of nine choices, respondents were asked to circle those people who offered them the most guidance in their college-choice decision. Parents were circled most often by all three groups, between 80.7% and 89.7% of cases. However, when asked about the role of parents in the decision, about two-thirds of each group (63.0% to 69.7%) said they offered general guidance but did not make the decision for them. The second most important person who gave guidance to all three groups was a friend already attending college (43.5% to 46.5%). In third place for FTIACs (34.6%) was a relative other than a parent, while for Inquirers (35.5%) and No-Shows (27.7%) it was high school counselor. However, about half of the respondents said the high school counselor did not help in the college-choice decision.

What Influences the Decision

Qualities desired in a college. Respondents were next asked to select six items from a list of 27 which they felt were the "most important" in helping them decide which college to attend. The top choice of Inquirers, *specific major or program,*

dropped to fifth place of No Shows and to sixth place for FTIACs. *Net cost after financial aid*, second for Inquirers and third for No-Shows, was not among the top six of FTIACs; *academic reputation* was sixth among Inquirers, but first or second for No-Shows and FTIACs. Only Inquirers selected *closeness to home* among the top six, only FTIACs selected *friendly campus* as part of that group. Table 1 shows all six top choices for each group, in order of selection.

Table 1

The Six Most Important Reasons for Selecting a College: In Percentages

| Inquirers | No-Shows | FTIACs |
|---|---|---|
| Specific major/program (58.1) | Academic reputation (56.2) | Christian atmosphere (75.5) |
| Net cost after financial aid (52.4) | Christian atmosphere (50.0) | Academic reputation (64.0) |
| Closeness to home (46.3) | Net cost after financial aid (49.6) | Overall reputation (61.6) |
| Overall reputation (45.5) | Overall reputation (48.2) | Number of students (55.1) |
| Number of students (44.7) | Specific major/program (47.4) | Friendly campus (42.6) |
| Academic reputation (44.3) | Number of students (44.9) | Specific major/program (35.5) |

Respondents were also asked what type of influence certain characteristics of Calvin had on their choice decision. The fact that Calvin is a Christian institution was seen as a positive influence by more than nine of ten No Shows (91.6%) and FTIACs (92.8%), but only two of three Inquirers (68.7%); the fact that it is a private institution also had a positive influence on fewer Inquirers (I: 60.1%, NS: 74.1%, F: 70.2). However, its specific denominational affiliation was seen as a negative influence by over half of Inquirers (57.1%) but decreased to only one third (34.7%) of FTIACs.

In 1991 and 1992, respondents were asked to respond to a series of semantic

differentials to describe Calvin by circling a number on a scale of one to five. Table 2 gives the mean values of each respondent group in both 1991 and 1992 for each pair of terms. In each pair, a score below the midpoint of three indicates a preference for the first term, and a score above the midpoint, preference for the second term. The 1992 FTIACs saw Calvin as much more Christian than did any other group; also, the institution was perceived as higher-priced by the FTIACs than by either group who did not attend. (Ns are not given as they varied in each pair for each group.)

Table 2

Mean Responses for Five Semantic Differentials Describing Calvin College, in 1991 and 1992: In Percentages

| | 1991 | | | 1992 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Terms | Inquirers | No-Shows | FTIACs | No-Shows | FTIACs |
| Secular - Christian | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.7 |
| Open admissions - Selective admissions | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.7 |
| Prestigious - Ordinary | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.6 |
| Strict - Lax | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 2.6 |
| Low priced - High priced | 3.5 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.9 |

We asked respondents in 1991 and 1992 to select from a list of 32 descriptors the six which described Calvin College and the six which described where they planned to attend (the second-choice school for FTIACs). To enable us to see across the funnel stages more easily, Table 3 shows percentages for the combined groups of FTIACs and No-Shows (there was only one survey of Inquirers). All three respondent groups

selected *Christian* most often to describe Calvin. We wonder how respondents defined *religious*, as we see it drop from second place for Inquirers to outside the top seven selected by FTIACs. Similarly, *small* drops away, as it appears among the top seven for Inquirers and No-Shows, but not for FTIACs. Percentage-wise, as people move through the funnel, more see Calvin as *friendly, academic, challenging,* and *personal.*

Table 3

Top Seven Descriptors Selected for Calvin College by Respondents in 1991 and 1992:

In Percentages

| Inquirers (N=223) | | No-Shows (N=586) | | FTIACs (N=1569) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Christian | 79.4 | Christian | 72.0 | Christian | 80.2 |
| Religious | 49.3 | Academic | 39.4 | Challenging | 44.6 |
| Small | 36.3 | Friendly | 33.1 | Academic | 42.4 |
| Friendly | 30.5 | Challenging | 32.4 | Friendly | 42.1 |
| Academic | 29.1 | Religious | 31.6 | Personal | 36.3 |
| Personal | 24.2 | Small | 25.1 | Fun | 28.7 |
| Student-oriented | 24.2 | Personal | 24.0 | Social | 28.5 |

For their other-choice school, all groups said they were seeking a school both *small* and *academic,* and all but the Inquirers listed *Christian* in their top six descriptors (see Table 4). No-Shows seem more solidified in describing their other-choice school, as their top six descriptors were selected by more than one third of respondents, compared to four of the Inquirers' top six and none of the FTIACs '. Only the FTIAC group included partying and secular in their top six descriptors.

By comparing Tables 3 (for FTIACs) and 4 (for Inquirers and No-Shows), we are able to look at the most-selected descriptors of the schools students actually chose to attend. All three groups included *challenging, academic, personal,* and *friendly.* Inquirers added *small* and *career-oriented* to that list. No-Shows kept the *small,* but included *Christian* instead of *career-oriented.* FTIACs kept the *Christian,* but selected *fun* instead of *small.*

Table 4

Top Six Descriptors Selected for Other School by Respondents in 1991 and 1992: In Percentages

| Inquirers (N=226) | | No-Shows (N=561) | | FTIACs (N=1335) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Challenging | 43.3 | Academic | 42.1 | Small | 28.7 |
| Academic | 39.4 | Small | 41.8 | Academic | 25.5 |
| Small | 38.5 | Challenging | 39.0 | Partying | 24.8 |
| Personal | 33.6 | Christian | 37.3 | Secular | 24.4 |
| Career-oriented | 32.3 | Personal | 34.9 | Christian | 22.2 |
| Friendly | 31.9 | Friendly | 33.7 | Career-oriented | 21.9 |

Respondents were asked to compare Calvin with the school they planned to attend (second choice school for FTIACs) on eleven characteristics. Response options were that the other school was better, Calvin was better, or both were the same. (In some cases, respondents wrote in "I don't know.") Table 5 looks at the response category which was selected most often by each group for each of the characteristics. Each group selected their school of choice as having the best *location, size of campus,*

and *recreational facilities*, although a much lower percentage of FTIACs saw Calvin's location as better than did the other two groups about their chosen schools. Respondent groups saw no difference between the two schools in *quality of faculty* and *teaching facilities*. Inquirers saw their school of choice as better in *academic reputation, location, contact with admissions staff, size of campus, recreational facilities, graduate school placement record* and *job/career placement record*. No-Shows saw their school of choice as better in *location, size of campus*, and *recreational facilities*.

Table 5

Comparison of College Characteristics Between Calvin and Other School: Categories Showing Highest Percentage

| | Inquirers | No-Shows | FTIACs |
|---|---|---|---|
| Academic reputation | other (50.9%) | same (41.2%) | Calvin (40.9%) |
| Quality of faculty | same (44.6%) | same (59.1%) | same (46.4%) |
| Reputation as Christian college | Calvin (70.6%) | Calvin (59.2%) | Calvin (68.5%) |
| Location | other (72.4% | other (61.7%) | Calvin (43.8%) |
| Contact with Admissions staff | other (50.1) | same (41.5%) | Calvin (46.8%) |
| Size of campus | other (57.1%) | other (46.0%) | Calvin (58.4%) |
| Teaching facilities | same (41.0%) | same (53.5%) | same (42.3%) |
| Recreational facilities | other (43.6%) | other (40.7%) | Calvin (40.4%) |
| Grad school placement record | other (41.1%) | same (52.7%) | same (45.3%) |
| Job/career placement record | other (48.1%) | same (55.1%) | same (49.0%) |
| Housing/dorms | same (33.5%) | Calvin (37.9%) | Calvin (62.5%) |

Financial aid. Those No-Shows and FTIACs who planned to attend another

school or had a second-choice school, and who were offered financial aid from both Calvin and the other school, were asked to compare the awards. A majority of both groups said the amount was better at the school they chose to attend.

Campus visit. Each year potential enrollees visit colleges and universities by the thousands in an attempt to narrow their selection. Do those visits make a difference? The 1991 study asked respondents if they had visited our campus before "deciding not to apply to," "deciding not to attend," or "deciding to attend" Calvin. Only 12% of Inquirers had visited the college, compared to 71% of No-Shows and 73% of FTIACs. But for those who did visit, 57.1% of Inquirers and 66.0% of FTIACs said the visit had no real impact one way or the other. However, 60.5% of No-Shows said it influenced them toward applying.

Again, of those who did visit, about half of No-Shows and FTIACs attended a Friday's at Calvin (a weekly, day-long presentation of tours, talks, and interaction with students and faculty), while Inquirers came for other reasons, mostly conferences and programs on campus.

Why Not Apply/Attend

Inquirers and No-Shows were given a list of 15 factors and asked to circle all those which most influenced their decision NOT to apply to/attend Calvin. Cost played an important part in that decision, as indicated by the high ratings given to *cost too high* and *received a better offer* (also *not enough financial aid* for No-Shows). Table 6 shows responses as ordered by Inquirers.

Table 6

What Most Influenced Respondent in Decision Not to Apply to/Attend Calvin:

In Percentages

| | Inquirers (N=244) | No-Shows (N=271) |
|---|---|---|
| Location | 48.0 | 41.0 |
| Cost too high | 37.3 | 43.9 |
| Received a better offer | 35.2 | 36.5 |
| Just lost interest | 28.7 | 13.3 |
| Didn't have my major/program | 19.3 | 12.9 |
| Other | 16.8 | 19.6 |
| Size | 16.0 | 14.4 |
| Not enough financial aid | 13.9 | 33.9 |
| Didn't want to go to a Christian college | 11.9 | 4.1 |
| Not selective enough | 9.0 | 7.0 |
| Family pressure | 8.2 | 6.6 |
| Not Christian enough | 6.1 | 10.7 |
| Academic reputation | 5.7 | 4.4 |
| Personal problems | 4.9 | 1.8 |
| Too selective | 3.3 | 1.5 |
| Didn't enjoy campus visit | 1.6 | 5.5 |

Because *location* doesn't tell us much in and of itself, we looked at how far those who selected it lived from campus. Calvin is apparently too far away from home for many, as 70.9% of Inquirers and 54.6% of No-Shows who selected *location* as a reason for not applying lived 300 miles or more from campus.

The high rank for *just lost interest* (I: 4th; NS: 7th) may indicate that these people were not too interested in Calvin in the first place.

When we crosstabulated those who listed unavailability of specific program or major as a reason not to apply or attend with their first program or major listed, 55.3% of Inquirers and 54.3% of No-Shows listed majors Calvin offers. In addition, 4.3% of these Inquirers said they were undecided about their intended major and 2.9% of these No-Shows had decided not to go to college.

Where They Went

The categorical school-of-choice of those who did not come to Calvin is shown in Table 7. More than any other type, Inquirers selected either an out-of-state public or another Christian college. Compared to No-Shows, Inquirers had a stronger preference for public (41.1%) or community colleges (17.5%). No-Shows selected another Christian college or an out-of-state non-Christian private.

Table 7

Where Inquirers and No-Shows Planned to Attend, 1990, 1991, 1992: In Percentages

| | 1990 | 1991 | | 1992 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No-Shows (N=285) | Inquirers (N=229) | No-Shows (N=261) | No-Shows (N=179) |
| Other Christian colleges | 38.2 | 22.7 | 42.5 | 49.1 |
| Michigan Publics | 16.1 | 17.5 | 15.3 | 14.5 |
| Out-of-state publics | 13.0 | 23.6 | 11.9 | 8.9 |
| Michigan non-Christian, private | 5.6 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 3.9 |
| Out-of-state Non-Christian, private | 17.9 | 17.0 | 16.9 | 18.4 |
| Community college | 6.3 | 17.5 | 6.1 | 5.0 |
| Other | 2.5 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 0.0 |

The Respondents

Because percentages were very similar across the study years, in this section we have combined respondents from all three years to show only one percentage per attribute for each group. While respondents were predominately female in all groups (57.4% to 82.0%), the percentage was highest for Inquirers and next highest for No-Shows (66.0%). FTIACs came from private high schools (63.3%) and from a background of the denomination which owns the college (63.0%) while Inquirers and No-Shows came from public schools (78.5% and 56.4%) and from other church backgrounds (93.5% and 63.5%). High school grade point average (GPA) shows a decrease in the quality of those who remained in the admissions funnel: 47.6% of Inquirers had a GPA of 3.6 to

4.0, compared to only 37.4% of FTIACs. ACT composite scores, however, were similar for Inquirers and FTIACs (40.8% and 37.8% had scores of 26 or higher); No-Shows were slightly higher (43.4%). Only in 1991 were respondents asked how far they lived from Calvin; 60.9% of FTIACs, 57.7% of No-Shows and 49.2% of Inquirers lived under 300 miles from campus.

If funds become available, further analysis could be done looking at how the factors which affect the college-choice process differ among these groups.

## Application of the Data

Admissions has used results from the study to improve marketing of the college to potential students, beginning with the 1993-94 freshman class. A major concern had developed: in 1991 the college experienced its highest yield of scholarship recipients in 20 years, but this masked the real problems, for in 1992 its yield was lowest in those 20 years.

Merit scholarship awards have been greatly increased to address the fact that Calvin's awards were not comparable to other schools. Also, need-based aid has been increased to target certain low-yield groups.

Publications have been changed to focus more on issues which troubled respondents or areas about which they seemed uninformed. New publications put forth a unified message without trying to be all things to all people, attempting to increase name recognition, the visibility of the college's academic excellence, and the perceived value of a Calvin education. Their focus is on four areas: Calvin's Christ-centered perspective, academic excellence, community, and service.

A new type of college advertisement has been developed. There has been a

unified local ad campaign for visibility and to attract more people to campus, as well as new ads in national and regional church publications -- including but not limited to the Christian Reformed Church. These ads accentuate Calvin's openness to all Christians who are serious about developing and applying their faith in their studies and their lives.

The Friday's at Calvin program of campus visits has been revised to include some of the suggestions given by respondents. Very little of the program is now in plenary session, aimed at reducing the perception that Calvin is overly "large." Students are able to interact with more people and have their own inquiries addressed directly as they now have opportunity to visit personally with students and college personnel during each Friday's program. In addition, Admissions has enhanced the training given to student tour guides and upgraded the personal attention given to students making special visits to Calvin.

The Admissions Office has increased contact with admitted students during that time between acceptance and enrollment. Students now receive a whole track of correspondence following their admission, as well as calls from students, admissions personnel, and faculty. All admitted students considering comparable colleges are encouraged to visit Calvin before making their final decision.

## References


Ihlanfeldt, W. (1980). *Achieving Optimal Enrollments and Tuition Revenues.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kottler, P. and Andreasen, A. R. (1987). *Strategic Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations (3rd Edition).* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Litten, L. H. (1980). Marketing Higher Education: Benefits and Risks for the American Academic System. *Journal of Higher Education* 51,1 (January-February), 40-59.

Litten, L.H., Sullivan, D., and Brodigan, D.L. (1983). *Applying Market Research in College Admissions.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Urban, R. F. (1992). Increasing Admitted Student Yield Using a Political Targeting Model and Discriminant Analysis: An Institutional Research-Admissions Partnership. *AIR Professional File Number 45,* Summer 1992.